## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claim 66 has been canceled. Claims 1-14, 16-17, 21-23, 25-43, 45-55, 61, and 68 are pending, of which claims 49 and 61 have been amended.

### Teleconference with Examiner

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time for our teleconference on April 19, 2007, and the Examiner's efforts to clarify pending issues to advance prosecution of the subject application. The pending independent claims were discussed with respect to the O'Connell reference. Examiner Sellers considered suggested claim amendments that would likely overcome the O'Connell reference. Specifically, the recited feature of "assigning at least one of the multiple streams of audio wave data to more than one of the logical buses" was discussed in combination with the other amended features.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 26, 49, and 61 incorporate the recommended claim language in an effort to place the application in condition for allowance over the cited references. However, the Examiner reserved the right to further evaluate the references of record and/or conduct a further search for any additional references.

### 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claims 1-14, 16-17, 21-23, 25-43, 45-55, 61, 66, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter (*Office*

*Action* p.2). Specifically, the Office rejects the claims for not positively reciting a useful and tangible result, and that "the end result claim 1 is storing the transformed audio content into an audio buffer".

Applicant respectfully disagrees because claim 1 positively recites the audio rendition managers process the audio instructions to render the corresponding audio renditions (claim 1, 4th element). Rendering an audio rendition is a useful and tangible result. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §101 rejection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

**A.** Claims 1-14, 16-17, 22-23, 26-43, 46-47, 49, and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,942,707 to Tamura (hereinafter, "Tamura") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,707 to Maher et al. (hereinafter, "Maher"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,596,159 to O'Connell (hereinafter, "O'Connell") (*Office Action* p.3).

**B.** Claims 21, 25, 45, 48, 50-51, 61, 66, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Tamura, Maher, O'Connell, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,251 to Su et al. (hereinafter, "Su") (*Office Action* p.10). Claim 66 is canceled herein. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

**Claim 1** recites a method comprising:

> …
>
> dynamically generating audio rendition managers that each correspond to an audio rendition, an audio rendition manager including dynamically allocated components that include a synthesizer component, audio buffers, and logical buses that each correspond to one of the audio buffers;
>
> …
>
> assigning at least one of the multiple streams of audio wave data to more than one of the logical buses where the logical buses receive the at least one stream of audio wave data from the synthesizer component;

Tamura, Maher, and/or O'Connell do not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1. The Office recognizes that Tamura and Maher do not teach dynamically generating audio rendition managers with dynamically allocated components (*Office Action* p.4). The Office cites to O'Connell for dynamically generated components. However, the cited sections of O'Connell do not teach "dynamically allocated components that include a synthesizer component, audio buffers, and logical buses", as recited in claim 1.

O'Connell only describes "dynamic" aspects as "different levels of CPU performance, available memory and desired sound quality" (*O'Connell* col.11, lines 65-67). There is no indication in O'Connell of a synthesizer component, audio buffers, or logical buses being dynamically allocated, as recited in claim 1.

O'Connell also states that the "software structure is easily adaptable to new developments in sound synthesis technology" (*O'Connell* col.12, lines 1-2). But that statement is directed to new technology, and not the system described in O'Connell. For example, O'Connell states that "if additional synthesis algorithms are developed, the only program modification required to accommodate the new algorithm is a pointer to a new synthesis function (*O'Connell* col.11, lines 28-30).

There is still no indication in O'Connell of the dynamically allocated components as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, there is no stated rejection for the recited feature of "dynamically generating audio rendition managers". As stated above, the Office recognizes that Tamura and Maher do not teach dynamically generating audio rendition managers with dynamically allocated components (*Office Action* p.4). O'Connell is then only cited for the other dynamically allocated components (a synthesizer component, audio buffers, and logical buses) (*Office Action* p.4).

The Office also rejects claim 1 stating "it is implicit that each of the multiple streams is assigned to a logical bus" (*Office Action* p.4). However, O'Connell does not teach or suggest "assigning at least one of the multiple streams of audio wave data to more than one of the logical buses", as recited in claim 1. For example, see Applicant's Fig.4 and channel 1, item 404(1) that distributes audio wave data to more than one logical bus items 414(1) & 414(2). O'Connell does not show or describe any such configuration.

Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 25 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn. In addition, claims 21 and 25 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell and Su combination because Su does not address the deficiencies of O'Connell as described above.

**Claim 26** recites that "at least one stream of audio wave data is assigned to more than one of the logical buses". As described above in response to the

rejection of claim 1, Tamura, Maher, and/or O'Connell do not teach or suggest the recited feature. Accordingly, claim 26 along with dependent claims 27-43 and 45-48 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell combination, and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn. In addition, claims 45 and 48 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell and Su combination because Su does not address the deficiencies of O'Connell

**Claim 49** recites a "multi-bus component configured to receive the audio wave data at the defined logical buses where at least one stream of audio wave data is assigned to more than one of the logical buses". As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Tamura, Maher, and/or O'Connell do not teach or suggest the recited feature. Accordingly, claim 49 along with dependent claims 50-55 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell combination, and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn. In addition, claims 50-51 are allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell and Su combination because Su does not address the deficiencies of O'Connell.

**Claim 61** recites that "at least one stream of audio wave data is assigned to more than one of the defined logical buses". As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Tamura, Maher, and/or O'Connell do not teach or suggest the recited feature. Accordingly, claim 61 along with dependent claim 68 is allowable over the Tamura-Maher-O'Connell combination, and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn. In addition, claim 68 is allowable over the

Tamura-Maher-O'Connell and Su combination because Su does not address the deficiencies of O'Connell.

**Conclusion**

Pending claims 1-14, 16-17, 21-23, 25-43, 45-55, 61, and 68 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2007

By: / David Morasch 42,905 /
David A. Morasch
SBMC, p.s.
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 755-7250